The Evolution of Colonial Legitimacy: Three Case Studies in European Extraction Systems (1493–1948)

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

Abstract

This paper examines three pivotal moments in the evolution of European colonial legitimacy frameworks: the Papal Bulls and Treaty of Tordesillas (1493–1494), the Berlin Conference (1884–1885), and the League of Nations Mandate System (1919–1948). Through comparative analysis, it demonstrates that while the source of authority shifted from divine right to international law, and while participating powers expanded from two to dozens, the fundamental functional logic remained identical across all three systems. European powers consistently created legal mechanisms among themselves to divide non-European territories, prevent inter-European conflict, provide procedural legitimacy for violent extraction, and construct moral narratives masking material interests. This evolution reveals how elite extraction systems adapt surface legitimacy mechanisms to changing power configurations and ideological contexts while maintaining core patterns of exclusion, violence, and wealth transfer. The paper argues that understanding these adaptations is essential for recognizing how colonial patterns persist in contemporary international institutions and development discourse.

Introduction: The Pattern Beneath the Forms

In 1493, Pope Alexander VI issued a series of bulls dividing the newly "discovered" world between Spain and Portugal along a meridian line drawn through the Atlantic. In 1885, fourteen European powers gathered in Berlin to establish rules for recognizing colonial claims in Africa, creating the legal framework for the "Scramble for Africa." In 1920, the newly formed League of Nations created the Mandate System, placing former Ottoman territories under European "tutelage" ostensibly to prepare them for eventual independence. At first glance, these three moments appear radically different: religious versus secular authority, bilateral versus multilateral agreements, naked colonialism versus international trusteeship.

Yet beneath these surface differences lies a consistent pattern. In each case, European powers faced the same fundamental problem: how to make violent appropriation of other peoples' territories and resources appear legal and moral, both to domestic audiences and to each other. In each case, they solved this problem by creating legal frameworks among themselves that excluded indigenous peoples entirely, constructing elaborate moral narratives to justify extraction, coordinating among European elites to prevent inter-European conflict while

facilitating systematic violence against colonized populations, and establishing procedural mechanisms that transformed theft into lawful acquisition.

This paper examines these three systems comparatively to demonstrate a crucial insight about how power operates across historical periods: elite extraction systems adapt surface legitimacy mechanisms to accommodate changing power configurations and ideological contexts while maintaining identical functional logic. The source of authority evolved from divine right to secular international law. The number of participating powers expanded from two Catholic monarchies to a global system of states. The moral narratives shifted from evangelization to civilization to development and self-determination. Yet the core functions persisted: dividing non-European territories among European powers, excluding indigenous peoples from decisions about their own lands, preventing conflicts among the powerful while enabling violence against the powerless, and providing legal cover for systematic extraction.

Understanding this pattern matters because it continues. Contemporary international institutions, development frameworks, and humanitarian intervention doctrines echo the same functional logic as the Papal Bulls, Berlin Conference, and Mandate System. Recognizing how colonial legitimacy frameworks evolved across five centuries helps us see how they persist today under new names. The following three case studies examine each system in detail before conducting comparative analysis to illuminate the enduring patterns of colonial extraction and their ongoing consequences.

Case Study One: The Papal Bulls and Treaty of Tordesillas (1493–1494)

Foundation Conditions: New Worlds, Religious Authority, Iberian Dominance

Christopher Columbus's 1492 voyage to what Europeans believed were the Indies created an immediate crisis for the Christian powers of late fifteenth-century Europe. Both Spain and Portugal, the era's dominant maritime powers, claimed rights to the newly encountered territories. The potential for war between Catholic powers over lands inhabited by non-Christian peoples required resolution through the highest available authority: the papacy.

The Pope held unique legitimacy as arbiter among Christian rulers in 1493. This authority derived from multiple sources: the theological claim to be the Vicar of Christ on Earth, the political reality of papal necessity as broker among Catholic monarchies, the legal tradition of canon law as an international framework, and precedent from crusading history in which popes had authorized wars against non-Christians. The Doctrine of Discovery, rooted in medieval legal thought, held that Christian rulers could claim sovereignty over "pagan" and "savage" lands. As Christ's earthly representative, the Pope could distribute these territories among Christian princes.

Iberian hegemony shaped this moment decisively. Portugal had pioneered Atlantic exploration from 1415 through the 1490s and controlled African coastal trade routes. Spain had recently unified under Ferdinand and Isabella in 1469, sponsored Columbus's voyage, and was rapidly ascending as a great power. Other European powers such as France and England possessed secondary maritime capabilities and remained distracted by European conflicts. The prize appeared enormous: Columbus claimed to have reached the Indies, promising gold and silver from American mineral wealth, access to spices from Asian trade routes, souls to convert for religious justification, and strategic positioning for further expansion.

Narrative Construction: Divine Mission, Evangelization, Civilizing the Heathen

Pope Alexander VI, a Spanish-born pontiff named Rodrigo Borgia, constructed elaborate legitimating narratives in his 1493 bulls. The papal bull Inter Caetera, issued May 4, 1493, proclaimed: "by the authority of Almighty God... we... give, grant, and assign to you [Ferdinand and Isabella] and your heirs and successors, kings of Castile and Leon, all islands and mainlands found and to be found, discovered and to be discovered..." This language established several core narratives that would prove remarkably durable across centuries of colonial expansion.

First, divine authorization: God's authority transmitted through the papal office to Christian monarchs justified territorial claims. Second, evangelization duty: the primary stated purpose was converting souls to Christianity. Third, a civilizing mission: bringing Christian civilization to "barbarous nations." Fourth, spiritual warfare: extending Christendom against pagan lands. Fifth, royal righteousness: the Catholic Monarchs were uniquely worthy of this sacred trust.

These narratives performed multiple functions simultaneously. They provided theological legitimacy by framing conquest as sacred duty. They offered moral cover, masking gold-seeking as soul-saving. They gave the Pope political leverage through arbitration between competing powers. They justified the enterprise to Spanish and Portuguese subjects, who could view it as divine mission rather than piracy. They created a framework that other Christian rulers were expected to respect through inter-European legitimacy.

The contradiction between stated purpose and actual practice emerged immediately. The bulls proclaimed humanitarian and evangelical goals while authorizing the seizure of inhabited lands, subordination of indigenous peoples, extraction of wealth, and eventually enslavement. The narrative masked extraction from the outset, establishing a pattern that would recur across centuries: colonial powers consistently proclaim benevolent intentions while pursuing material gain through violence.

Legal and Institutional Framework: Papal Decrees and Bilateral Treaty

The legal architecture of this system consisted of papal bulls followed by bilateral treaty. Inter Caetera established a line of demarcation one hundred leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands, granting Spain all lands west of this line and Portugal all lands east of it. An exclusion clause

prohibited any Christian from entering these territories without Spanish or Portuguese permission. The penalty for violation was excommunication, the most serious sanction available in the Catholic world.

Portugal objected that this line favored Spain too heavily. Through bilateral negotiations, the two powers produced the Treaty of Tordesillas on June 7, 1494. This treaty shifted the line of demarcation to 370 leagues west of Cape Verde, moving it approximately 800 miles westward. Spain and Portugal mutually recognized each other's zones and established procedural rules for handling future discoveries and boundary disputes. Pope Julius II sanctioned the treaty in 1506, providing papal legitimacy to the bilateral agreement.

The legal characteristics of this system reveal its fundamental nature. Authority derived from divine right mediated through papal office. Only Catholic powers recognizing papal authority were bound by these rules. The geographic scope encompassed the entire non-Christian world. The procedural mechanism was simple: draw an imaginary line, grant exclusive rights on each side, and prohibit intrusion. Enforcement relied on theological sanction through excommunication combined with bilateral agreement to respect boundaries.

The critical feature of this system was the complete exclusion of indigenous peoples. Lands with existing governments, populations, and civilizations were treated as vacant territories available for Christian appropriation under the doctrine of terra nullius. The "law" operated exclusively within the European club; indigenous sovereignty simply did not exist within this framework. European Christians created a legal system among themselves to distribute other peoples' lands. The legal fiction was absolute: Spaniards and Portuguese could make legitimate claims only against each other, never against the peoples whose lands they were appropriating.

Wealth Extraction: Gold, Silver, Land, Labor, Souls as Cover

Despite evangelical rhetoric, material extraction drove Spanish and Portuguese expansion from the beginning. Spanish conquest of the Americas focused intensely on precious metals. Massive silver and gold extraction from mines such as Potosí transformed the Spanish economy and European monetary systems. The encomienda system granted conquistadors control over land and indigenous labor, creating a legal framework for forced servitude. Indigenous peoples were compelled to work in mines and plantations under conditions of extreme brutality. Agricultural wealth from sugar, tobacco, and later coffee flowed to Spain through mercantile systems designed to funnel colonial profits to the metropole.

Portuguese colonization followed similar patterns. Brazil yielded gold, diamonds, and sugar. Portugal controlled the African slave trade, capturing labor for American plantations. Portuguese merchants dominated spice trade routes to Asia. Land grant systems similar to Spanish encomiendas distributed territory and indigenous labor to Portuguese colonists. The trans-Atlantic trading system connected Africa, the Americas, and Europe in circuits of extraction that depended fundamentally on forced labor and violent appropriation.

The contradiction between stated narrative and operational reality could not have been sharper. The narrative emphasized saving souls and spreading civilization. The reality centered on mining operations, plantation agriculture, trade monopolies, and slavery. Religious institutions did conduct evangelization, but missions also facilitated extraction through mission labor systems and land control. Some missionaries genuinely believed in the conversion mission, but colonial administrators consistently used religion as legitimation for economic conquest. The "souls" justification provided moral cover while extraction proceeded according to its own brutal logic.

Resistance Suppression: Conquest, Encomienda, Inquisition

Military conquest formed the foundation of Spanish and Portuguese colonial control. Conquistadors such as Cortés and Pizarro led expeditions that destroyed indigenous empires including the Aztec and Inca civilizations. Superior weaponry gave Europeans decisive advantages: firearms, steel weapons, and horses provided technological superiority over indigenous arms. Disease, particularly smallpox and measles, devastated indigenous populations in what amounted to unintentional biological warfare. Spanish forces also exploited conflicts among indigenous groups, allying with peoples such as the Tlaxcalans against the Aztecs.

Legal violence through the encomienda system complemented military force. Spanish crown grants gave conquistadors rights to indigenous labor, tribute collection powers, and land control while imposing supposed duties to provide protection and Christian instruction. The reality was functional slavery operating under legal cover. The Requerimiento, a legal document introduced in 1513, exemplified the cynical use of law to justify violence. This document was read to indigenous peoples in Spanish, which they did not understand, demanding recognition of Catholic Church authority and submission to the Spanish crown. Refusal to submit to an authority they could not comprehend constituted grounds for "just war," providing procedural legitimacy for conquest.

The Inquisition and systematic cultural destruction reinforced control. Colonial authorities suppressed indigenous religions, destroyed cultural artifacts and texts, forced conversion to Christianity, and punished supposed heresy or idolatry. The population collapse in colonized regions exceeded ninety percent in many areas within decades of contact. This catastrophe resulted from multiple causes: epidemic disease, warfare, forced labor systems, famine from agricultural disruption, and social collapse. The demographic devastation of the Americas represents one of the greatest catastrophes in human history, executed under the legal and moral cover of Christian evangelization.

Elite Network Coordination: Iberian Bilateral Agreement and Papal Mediation

The coordination problem was straightforward: two Catholic powers seeking overseas empires needed to avoid war with each other. The solution was mutual recognition of exclusive zones

mediated by papal authority. Spain and Portugal negotiated directly to produce the Treaty of Tordesillas, adjusting the papal line through compromise. Both powers recognized each other's claims, agreed to police their respective zones, and settled subsequent disputes through negotiation such as the Treaty of Zaragoza in 1529, which divided the Pacific Ocean.

The papal role combined arbitration, theological legitimation, and enforcement through the threat of excommunication. The Pope gained influence by serving as mediator between competing Catholic powers. System maintenance depended on both powers policing their own zones, respecting each other's boundaries, jointly excluding other European powers, and suppressing indigenous resistance separately within their designated spheres.

Spain and Portugal created a duopoly, a closed system that excluded other European powers, indigenous peoples, and later entrants to colonial competition. This elite club coordinated effectively as long as its foundational assumptions held: papal authority remained recognized, both powers could enforce their respective monopolies, and no excluded parties gained sufficient power to challenge the system. When these conditions changed, the system collapsed.

System Breakdown: Protestant Powers, Declining Iberian Hegemony

The Tordesillas system failed because its foundational authority became contested and its enforcers weakened. Martin Luther's Reformation beginning in 1517 challenged papal authority fundamentally. Protestant powers such as England and the Netherlands rejected the Pope's right to distribute the world. Queen Elizabeth I of England famously demanded to see Adam's will excluding her from the division. The theological basis for legitimacy collapsed for non-Catholic powers.

Even Catholic France challenged the Spanish-Portuguese monopoly. King Francis I declared in 1525 that he must see Adam's testament leaving the world to Spain and Portugal alone. France established colonies despite the treaty, demonstrating that papal sanction meant little when conflicted with perceived national interests. Iberian decline accelerated through the seventeenth century as Spanish imperial overreach produced economic stagnation and Portugal suffered from Spanish absorption between 1580 and 1640 and Dutch competition in Asian trade.

Rising powers ignored Tordesillas entirely. England established Caribbean colonies beginning in 1607 and North American settlements throughout the seventeenth century. The Netherlands seized territories in the East Indies and founded New Amsterdam, later New York. France colonized Canada, Louisiana, and Caribbean islands. None of these powers acknowledged Tordesillas as binding. Hugo Grotius articulated the "freedom of the seas" doctrine in Mare Liberum in 1608, providing legal theory for rejecting the Iberian monopoly.

By the eighteenth century, naval power determined colonial control, not papal decrees. The principle that possession constituted nine-tenths of the law replaced papal bulls as the operative rule. The lesson was clear: legitimacy frameworks function only when all powerful players accept the authority source, powers can enforce agreements, and no excluded parties gain

sufficient strength to challenge the system. When Protestant powers rose, Iberian powers declined, and papal authority fractured, a new framework became necessary for the next wave of colonial expansion.

Case Study Two: The Berlin Conference (1884–1885)

Foundation Conditions: Industrial Capitalism, Nationalism, African Resources

By 1884, European industrial capitalism created unprecedented demands for extraction. Raw materials required by industrial production included rubber for tires at profit margins exceeding seven hundred percent, palm oil for machinery lubrication, minerals including diamonds, gold, and copper, ivory despite declining supply, and timber varieties such as mahogany and okoumé. African populations represented potential consumers of European manufactured goods. Surplus European capital sought profitable investment opportunities in colonial infrastructure projects, mining operations, and plantation agriculture.

Nationalist competition intensified colonial ambitions. Colonial prestige equated to national greatness in late nineteenth-century European political culture. States competed for territory because size mattered in measuring relative power, for strategic positioning controlling key routes and ports, for denying rivals advantages, and for domestic political gains from rallying publics around imperial glory. The specific crises of 1884 brought these competitive pressures to a head.

Leopold II of Belgium's International Association of the Congo claimed vast central African territories through treaties Stanley negotiated with local leaders, treaties whose legitimacy was highly dubious. France countered with expeditions led by Brazza. Portugal invoked historical claims based on centuries of presence. Britain feared French or Leopold monopoly over the Congo River basin. All powers eyed the region's resources with acute interest. Anglo-French tensions extended beyond the Congo. British control of Egypt in 1882 angered France. West African conflicts over boundaries in Senegal and the Gold Coast created friction. Competition for influence produced recurring crises.

Germany's entry into colonial competition complicated matters further. Newly unified in 1871, Germany sought colonial prestige and claimed Cameroon, Togo, Southwest Africa, and East Africa. These claims conflicted with British territorial ambitions. Chancellor Bismarck wanted to manage this competition to prevent it from igniting European war. These overlapping claims created the immediate problem the Berlin Conference addressed: rules were needed to prevent European conflict while enabling African conquest.

Narrative Construction: Antislavery, Free Trade, Civilization, Humanitarian Façade

Conference participants constructed elaborate justifications bearing striking resemblance to earlier colonial narratives despite the secular context. Antislavery rhetoric featured prominently. The Conference General Act proclaimed commitment to ending slavery by African and Islamic powers. Colonial control would supposedly suppress the Arab slave trade. The cynicism was breathtaking: even as they claimed to end slavery, European powers instituted forced labor systems in Leopold's rubber terror, Portuguese contratados, and French corvée that were functionally identical to slavery.

Free trade and commerce provided another narrative pillar. The conference promised freedom of commerce in the Congo Basin and claimed to open Africa to beneficial trade. The reality proved opposite: colonial monopolies, concessionaire companies, and closed markets for metropolitan goods characterized actual practice. Civilization and progress rhetoric dominated official pronouncements. Article 6 of the General Act committed signatories to watching over the preservation of native tribes and caring for improvement of conditions of their moral and material well-being. Education, health care, and infrastructure were promised. The reality was minimal services for Africans and infrastructure designed exclusively for extraction.

Religious freedom guarantees and protection for missionary societies provided additional moral cover. The reality was that missions facilitated colonial control and cultural destruction. Scientific exploration framed colonization as advancing geographical knowledge, with explorers such as Stanley and Brazza portrayed as heroes. The reality was that exploration constituted reconnaissance for exploitation. Joseph Conrad satirized this humanitarian façade brilliantly in Heart of Darkness in 1899, sarcastically calling Leopold's enterprise the "International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs," exposing how civilizing rhetoric masked brutal extraction.

The functional parallel to Papal Bulls narratives is striking. Where the bulls emphasized spreading Christianity, the Berlin Conference emphasized spreading civilization. Saving souls became improving natives. God's will became historical progress. Religious duty transformed into humanitarian duty. Converting pagans became civilizing savages. Divine mission evolved into the White Man's Burden. Church supervision gave way to international supervision. The function remained identical: moral cover for violent extraction.

Legal and Institutional Framework: Effective Occupation, Notification, Mutual Recognition

The General Act of Berlin, signed February 26, 1885, established six key declarations that created the legal architecture for colonial expansion. Congo Basin neutrality declared the region neutral with free trade for all nations, though this was never honored and World War I extended into the Congo. Free navigation supposedly opened the Congo and Niger rivers to all nations, though colonial powers controlled actual access. Slave trade prohibition was formally proclaimed but immediately violated through forced labor systems.

The notification requirement mandated that powers notify other signatories of new territorial claims, giving rivals opportunity to object and establishing a record of claims. This procedural

innovation created transparency among European powers while maintaining complete opacity regarding African interests. The principle of effective occupation, articulated in Articles 34 and 35, constituted the critical legal innovation of the Berlin Conference.

To claim territory legitimately, a power had to demonstrate several defined requirements: treaties with local leaders, though these were typically obtained through force, fraud, or with chiefs who did not understand what they were signing; flags flying as symbolic presence; administration established through some governmental structure; police forces to maintain order, which meant military forces to suppress resistance; and theoretical protection of rights and trade. The genius of this system lay in its appearance of rigor while remaining permissive in practice.

The effective occupation principle created procedural legitimacy that appeared rigorous by requiring actual presence rather than mere paper claims, yet proved permissive because Britain successfully argued that coastal presence implied hinterland claims. It created urgency as powers rushed to effectively occupy territories before rivals. It legitimated violence by defining police forces as necessary for effective occupation. Most importantly, it enabled mutual recognition: if a power met these requirements, others recognized the claim.

Debates over interpretation revealed competing interests. Germany advocated strict interpretation requiring strong, continuous political authority throughout claimed territories and actual governance. Britain preferred loose interpretation in which coastal bases sufficed under a hinterland theory and minimal administration was acceptable. Britain's position prevailed, allowing European powers to "conquer" Africa while doing minimal work to actually administer territories.

Spheres of influence received first international recognition at Berlin. Within designated spheres, powers held exclusive rights to establish control and other powers agreed not to interfere. Just as with the Tordesillas system, the Berlin Conference created a legal system among Europeans to distribute African territories. Africans had no representation at the conference, no input on rules, no recognized sovereignty, and no legal standing in the system. The procedural legitimacy was entirely intra-European: if you follow these procedures, we recognize your claim. Africans were completely excluded from the legal framework.

The source of authority shifted from the religious foundation of papal bulls to secular international law based on agreement among sovereign states, diplomatic consensus through multilateral treaty, the concept of civilization as represented by the European club of civilized nations, and balance of power through great power coordination. Despite these differences in form, the function remained constant: Europeans dividing the non-European world among themselves.

Wealth Extraction: Rubber, Minerals, Forced Labor, Concessionaire Capitalism

Immediate post-conference extraction patterns revealed the true purposes behind civilizing rhetoric. The Belgian Congo, Leopold's personal fief, experienced the rubber terror with wild

rubber collection enforced through hostage-taking, mutilation, and mass murder. Systematic elephant slaughter provided ivory. Profit margins reached seven hundred to one thousand percent. The death toll approached ten million people between 1885 and 1920. The Berlin Conference had granted Leopold sovereignty, providing legal cover for genocide.

French Equatorial Africa saw over forty concessionaire companies granted monopoly concessions covering seventy percent of the territory. These companies employed terror tactics similar to Leopold's for rubber and ivory collection. The Congo-Ocean Railway built between 1921 and 1934 cost seventeen thousand to twenty thousand deaths. Population declined thirty to fifty percent in some areas. German colonies in Cameroon, Togo, East Africa, and Southwest Africa focused on plantation agriculture and forced labor for rubber, minerals, and agricultural products. The Namibian genocide between 1904 and 1908 killed eighty percent of the Herero and Namaqua peoples.

British colonies in Nigeria produced palm oil, rubber, and minerals. The Gold Coast yielded gold and cocoa. East African territories grew coffee and sisal while also producing minerals. Southern Africa's diamond fields in Kimberley and gold mines in the Witwatersrand generated enormous wealth extracted to Britain. Portuguese colonies in Angola and Mozambique produced coffee through forced cultivation, diamonds through the Diamang monopoly, and contract labor that was functionally identical to slavery despite Berlin's antislavery proclamations.

The pattern held across all colonies. Forced labor operated universally despite antislavery rhetoric. Concessionaire companies received sovereign authority over vast territories. When Africans received wages at all, they were pittances. Violence served as the standard enforcement mechanism through beating, imprisonment, and killing to enforce quotas. Infrastructure served extraction exclusively, with railways connecting mines to ports. Resource flows moved raw materials to Europe and manufactured goods, if any, back to Africa. The functional continuity with earlier extraction systems was perfect: where the Papal Bulls system had enabled Spanish and Portuguese mines, plantations, and encomiendas, the Berlin Conference system enabled rubber terror, mining compounds, and forced cultivation. Same logic, different resources and geographies.

Resistance Suppression: Military Conquest, Punitive Expeditions, Legal Violence

Following the Berlin Conference, the effective occupation requirement triggered systematic military campaigns extending from 1885 through the 1920s. French forces conducted pacification of West and Central Africa. Britain conquered Nigeria, East Africa, and Sudan. Germany prosecuted wars in Southwest and East Africa. Belgium's Force Publique suppressed resistance throughout the Congo. Portugal completed interior conquest of Angola and Mozambique. These were not isolated incidents but coordinated campaigns of violent subjugation.

Technological advantages enabled small European forces to massacre large African armies. The Maxim gun, invented in 1884, provided machine gun fire that devastated massed infantry. Railroads enabled rapid troop deployment across vast distances. Telegraph systems allowed coordination across territories. Steamships penetrated rivers, particularly the Congo River system. Quinine reduced European casualties from malaria, removing a major impediment to interior penetration.

Specific atrocities demonstrated the systematic nature of colonial violence. The Congo's rubber collection system operated through hostage-taking, village burning, and mutilation. The Namibian genocide between 1904 and 1908 represented deliberate German policy to exterminate the Herero and Namaqua peoples. The Maji Maji Rebellion suppression in East Africa between 1905 and 1907 killed seventy-five thousand to three hundred thousand people.

Legal violence operated through administrative systems that created dual legal frameworks. France's Code de l'Indigénat subjected Africans to administrative detention without trial, legal corporal punishment, travel restrictions, and forced labor as punishment. Portugal's Indigenato established separate legal systems for natives with similar detention powers and contract labor providing legal cover for forced labor. Belgium's indigénat system in the Congo employed chiefs as enforcement agents, normalized corporal punishment through the chicotte whip, and legally mandated forced labor.

The pattern created dual legal systems where Europeans enjoyed regular law, rights, and courts while Africans faced administrative justice without rights and with corporal punishment and forced labor as standard penalties. Systematic terror became normalized policy. Leopold's Force Publique required severed hands to prove bullets had been used on humans rather than wasted on hunting. Village burning served as collective punishment for resistance or quota failures. Hostage-taking of women and children forced male labor. Crops were destroyed and food withheld to induce starvation. Sexual violence operated as a systematic terror tactic.

All this violence occurred under legal cover provided by the Berlin Conference framework. Effective occupation required police forces. Maintaining order justified military campaigns. Protecting trade justified suppressing resistance. The civilizing mission justified cultural destruction. The legal framework transformed genocide into lawful administration.

Elite Network Coordination: Great Power Concert, Bilateral Negotiations, Mutual Recognition

Fourteen European powers competing for African territory required sophisticated coordination mechanisms to recognize each other's claims, resolve boundary disputes, prevent wars over colonies, and coordinate exploitation. The notification system required powers claiming territory to notify other signatories, allowing rivals to object if they held prior claims. If no objection emerged and effective occupation was proven, the claim received recognition.

Post-Berlin bilateral boundary commissions negotiated specific borders. Britain and France reached multiple agreements covering West Africa, East Africa, and other regions. Britain and

Germany settled borders in East Africa and Southwest Africa. France and Germany negotiated the boundary between Cameroon and French Equatorial Africa. Dozens of such agreements translated the general Berlin principles into specific territorial divisions. Diplomatic conferences continued managing conflicts. The Brussels Conference in 1890 produced further antislavery agreements, though these remained hypocritical. Various territorial disputes were settled diplomatically rather than militarily.

Spheres of influence received mutual recognition. Within designated spheres, other powers agreed not to interfere. The power controlling a sphere held first rights to expansion. Buffer zones separated competing spheres. The Concert of Europe, the great power coordination system for managing European affairs, extended to Africa. Great powers coordinated to maintain balance of power, prevent any single power from dominating, share colonial spoils, and maintain order among themselves.

Benefits for the elite club were substantial. European wars over colonies were avoided until World War I. Territorial claims received legitimation through mutual recognition. Extraction was coordinated rather than competitive in ways that might benefit Africans. A shared legal framework governed colonial administration. Indigenous exclusion operated at every level. The Berlin Conference itself, bilateral negotiations, and boundary commissions all excluded Africans entirely. Africans possessed no diplomatic recognition, no legal standing, no input on boundaries. Borders were drawn through kingdoms, cutting ethnic groups in half. Traditional rulers were forced to accept European sovereignty or face destruction.

The parallel to Tordesillas coordination is instructive. Where Tordesillas involved bilateral negotiation between Spain and Portugal, Berlin required multilateral coordination among fourteen nations. Where papal mediation resolved Tordesillas disputes, diplomatic conferences managed Berlin conflicts. Where a simple line divided the globe under Tordesillas, complex bilateral negotiations created boundaries under Berlin. Where a two-power duopoly characterized Tordesillas, a multi-power oligopoly emerged from Berlin. The enforcement mechanisms differed: mutual respect plus papal pressure under Tordesillas versus mutual recognition plus great power diplomatic pressure under Berlin. Yet the function remained constant: European elite coordination excluding non-Europeans from decisions about their own territories.

Long-Term Consequences: Colonial Borders and Post-Colonial Conflicts

The arbitrary borders created at Berlin with zero regard for indigenous peoples generated conflicts lasting well over a century. Borders cut through approximately one hundred ninety cultural groups, split kingdoms, and forced traditional enemies together. The Kingdom of Kongo was divided among Belgian, Portuguese, and French territories. Somali people were split across five modern states. Straight lines were drawn through deserts and forests with no relationship to human geography. Post-independence conflicts trace directly to these colonial borders.

Julius Nyerere of Tanzania observed that we have artificial nations carved out at the Berlin Conference, struggling to build these nations into stable units. Resource extraction patterns

established under Berlin persist today. Mining of copper, cobalt, and coltan in the Democratic Republic of Congo continues in patterns established under Leopold. Diamonds in Botswana and elsewhere flow through systems originating in the colonial period. Cash crop agriculture maintains colonial economic relationships. Colonial concession companies evolved into post-independence state companies which then contracted with multinational corporations. Infrastructure remains extraction-focused, connecting mines to ports rather than serving internal development needs.

Legal frameworks and economic structures created under Berlin endure. Post-independence states inherited civil law from French and Portuguese colonies, common law from British colonies, land tenure systems treating all land as state property, resource ownership laws designating subsoil minerals as state property, and corporate law favoring foreign companies. International law embedded the Doctrine of Discovery in modern frameworks. State sovereignty principles derive from the European system. Contract law protects colonial-era agreements. Investment treaties favor multinational corporations. Former colonies continue exporting raw materials to former colonizers while importing manufactured goods from former metropoles. Financial systems such as the CFA franc in French Africa maintain colonial monetary relationships. Trade agreements preserve colonial economic patterns.

Case Study Three: The League of Nations Mandate System (1919–1948)

Foundation Conditions: The Spoils of War and the Oil Prize

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire following World War I created what European powers viewed as an unprecedented opportunity for territorial acquisition in the Middle East. However, the political landscape of 1919 differed dramatically from the 1880s Berlin Conference era. Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points had introduced the principle of self-determination into international discourse, making naked annexation politically untenable in the new post-war order. European powers needed a new legal mechanism that would allow them to control former Ottoman territories while appearing to respect these new international norms.

The discovery and growing strategic importance of oil in Mesopotamia, which would become Iraq, and Persia made these territories far more valuable than African colonies had been to earlier generations. The British Navy's conversion from coal to oil, completed just before World War I, meant that controlling oil supplies had become a matter of national security rather than mere economic advantage. Meanwhile, the Suez Canal, railway routes to India, and strategic positioning against the newly formed Soviet Union gave the region extraordinary geopolitical importance beyond its resource wealth.

Britain and France had already secretly divided these territories between themselves through the 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement, negotiated while the war still raged and while Britain was simultaneously promising Arab leaders independence in exchange for their revolt against

Ottoman rule. The European powers needed international legitimacy for what was essentially old-fashioned colonial conquest dressed in new language. The challenge was to create a framework that would allow them to control these territories while claiming to be preparing them for eventual self-government, a claim that would prove as hollow as earlier promises of evangelization and civilization.

Narrative Construction: The Sacred Trust of Civilization

The Mandate system represented a masterwork of paternalistic narrative construction, wrapping colonial domination in the language of international development and trusteeship. Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant declared that former Ottoman territories were inhabited by "peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world," and that therefore "the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations." This language accomplished several ideological objectives simultaneously while maintaining perfect continuity with earlier colonial narratives.

First, it positioned European control not as conquest but as humanitarian obligation, a "sacred trust of civilization" meant to guide backward peoples toward eventual self-government. The religious language of sacred trust deliberately echoed earlier evangelization narratives while operating in an ostensibly secular framework. Second, it created a hierarchy of mandates classified as A, B, and C that codified racist assumptions about different populations' capacity for self-rule. Class A mandates, which included Middle Eastern territories, were described as having "reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized," yet still requiring administrative guidance from European powers. The provisional nature of this recognition meant it could be postponed indefinitely.

Third, and most cynically, the narrative suggested that borders and state structures created by European powers represented the natural political organization of these regions, ignoring the fact that these very borders were being drawn simultaneously to serve European strategic interests rather than reflecting any organic political communities. The claim that Arabs needed guidance in governance conveniently overlooked centuries of complex political organization under the Ottoman Empire, as well as the specific promises of independence that Britain had made to Arab leaders during World War I in exchange for their revolt against Ottoman rule. Sharif Hussein of Mecca and his sons Faisal and Abdullah had fought against the Ottomans believing they were securing Arab independence, only to discover that Britain and France had already divided their territories between themselves.

The functional parallel to earlier narratives is precise. Where Papal Bulls had emphasized spreading Christianity, and the Berlin Conference had emphasized spreading civilization, the Mandate System emphasized guiding development. Saving souls became preparing for self-government. God's will became historical necessity and the requirements of modern statehood. Religious duty became international trusteeship. Converting pagans became modernizing backwards populations. Divine mission became the sacred trust of civilization. The function remained identical across all three systems: providing moral cover for extraction and control while excluding colonized peoples from any meaningful agency in their own governance.

Legal Framework: International Legitimacy for Colonial Control

The League of Nations Mandate system created a novel legal architecture that transformed colonialism into internationalized trusteeship. Unlike the Papal Bulls, which derived authority from divine right, or the Berlin Conference, which rested on European consensus alone, the Mandate system operated through a new international organization that claimed to represent global interests. This shift from bilateral or multilateral agreements among European powers to action through an ostensibly universal international organization proved crucial for legitimizing what was fundamentally the same imperial project.

The legal structure worked through multiple layers of authorization. The League of Nations officially held sovereignty over the mandated territories but delegated administration to specific "advanced nations" through Mandate agreements. These agreements theoretically made mandatory powers accountable to the League's Permanent Mandates Commission, which would receive annual reports and could make recommendations. In practice, however, the Commission possessed no enforcement power, and mandatory powers acted as sovereign rulers with minimal constraints.

The genius of this framework lay in creating multiple layers of legal fiction. First, it suggested international oversight where none meaningfully existed. The Permanent Mandates Commission could question mandatory powers and make recommendations, but it could not compel any action or sanction violations. Second, it framed European control as temporary tutelage rather than permanent annexation, though no clear metrics for readiness for independence were ever established, and mandatory powers consistently delayed any movement toward self-government. Third, it created a distinction between mandates and colonies that was legally significant but practically meaningless. Mandatory powers exercised the same control over mandated territories as they did over formal colonies, including military occupation, economic exploitation, and suppression of independence movements.

Most significantly, the Mandate system provided legal cover for what the Sykes-Picot Agreement had already determined in secret wartime negotiations. Britain would control Mesopotamia, which became Iraq, Palestine, and Transjordan. France would control Syria and Lebanon. The League simply rubber-stamped these pre-existing arrangements, transforming secret wartime deals negotiated in violation of promises made to Arab allies into international law sanctioned by a supposedly neutral international organization. The legal innovation was not in substance but in form: finding a way to make old-fashioned colonial division of spoils compatible with new rhetoric about self-determination and international cooperation.

Actual Extraction: Oil, Strategic Control, and Economic Subordination

The economic reality of the Mandate system bore no resemblance to its stated humanitarian purposes. The primary function of mandatory control was to secure European access to resources and strategic assets while preventing local populations from controlling their own economic development. In Iraq, British mandatory control centered explicitly on oil extraction. The Iraq Petroleum Company, formed in 1925, granted Britain, France, the Netherlands, and the

United States control over Iraqi oil for seventy-five years. Iraqi interests were completely excluded from this arrangement despite Iraq being the territory from which the oil was extracted.

British administrators designed Iraq's tax and legal systems to facilitate oil extraction while generating revenue for the British administration itself rather than for Iraqi development. When Iraq gained nominal independence in 1932, ending the formal mandate, it was forced to sign treaties guaranteeing British military bases and oil access as conditions for this independence. The end of the mandate thus changed little in practice: Britain maintained control over Iraq's most valuable resource and continued to station military forces in the country.

Britain's Palestine Mandate served multiple extraction purposes that had nothing to do with preparing Palestinians for self-government. Strategic control of the land route to the Suez Canal remained paramount. Prevention of any rival power establishing presence near the canal guided policy. Facilitation of the Zionist settlement project, which Britain viewed as creating a friendly European-oriented population in a strategically vital location, shaped administrative decisions. The mandatory government's revenue came primarily from taxing Palestinian Arabs, while its development spending disproportionately benefited Zionist settlements and British strategic infrastructure such as ports and railways.

France's mandate over Syria and Lebanon focused on agricultural extraction, particularly cotton and grain, and maintaining access to Mediterranean ports for French trade. French mandatory authorities restructured Syrian and Lebanese economies to serve as markets for French manufactured goods and suppliers of raw materials, actively preventing local industrial development that might compete with French industry. Railway construction connected interior agricultural regions to coastal ports for export to France rather than being designed to serve local economic needs or facilitate internal Syrian and Lebanese development.

Across all mandates, monetary systems were tied to mandatory powers' currencies rather than being designed for local economic autonomy. Financial systems facilitated capital extraction rather than local investment. Legal frameworks prevented mandate populations from restricting foreign economic control. This was colonialism in every material sense, regardless of the legal terminology used to describe it. The sacred trust of civilization meant in practice systematic extraction of resources, subordination of local economic development to metropolitan interests, and prevention of genuine economic independence even when formal political independence was eventually granted.

Arbitrary Borders: Sykes-Picot Lines and the Dismemberment of Greater Syria

The borders created through the Mandate system represented perhaps the most consequential example of arbitrary colonial line-drawing in modern history. These borders were drawn based entirely on European strategic interests and internal European negotiations, with absolute disregard for existing political organization, tribal territories, sectarian geography, or local populations' wishes. The Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 divided the Arab territories of the Ottoman Empire along a line that had no relationship to any existing political, cultural, or

geographic reality. This line, drawn on a map by British diplomat Mark Sykes and French diplomat François Georges-Picot, cut through the historic region of Greater Syria.

Greater Syria had encompassed what became Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Palestine and Israel, and parts of Iraq and Turkey, functioning as an integrated region with shared economic systems, cultural connections, and historical ties. The mandate borders created five separate territories where integrated political and economic systems had previously existed. France's division of its mandate into Syria and Lebanon was explicitly designed to create a Christian-majority state in Lebanon that would be dependent on French protection against its Muslim-majority neighbors, ensuring long-term French influence in the region.

This partition cut through the middle of existing cities, separated coastal trading cities from their traditional agricultural hinterlands, and divided families and tribes. The border between Syria and Lebanon bisected the Bekaa Valley, split Sunni and Shia populations who had shared economic systems for centuries, and separated Damascus from Beirut despite centuries of economic integration. Britain's creation of Iraq combined three former Ottoman provinces with distinct identities: Mosul, predominantly Kurdish; Baghdad, mixed Sunni and Shia Arab; and Basra, predominantly Shia Arab. This decision ignored the fact that these populations had distinct political identities, spoke different languages with Kurds speaking Kurdish rather than Arabic, and belonged to different religious traditions.

The northern border of Iraq cut through Kurdish tribal territories, dividing Kurdish populations between Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria, creating the conditions for the Kurdish question that persists today. The southern border ignored tribal territories of groups that ranged across what became the Iraq-Kuwait border, generating disputes that contributed to the 1990 Gulf War. The Palestine borders were drawn to accommodate British strategic interests in the Suez Canal and Zionist settlement plans rather than to create a viable political unit. Transjordan was created as a separate mandate primarily to provide a throne for Abdullah, Faisal's brother, after Faisal was given Iraq as compensation for being expelled from Syria by France.

None of these borders reflected any pre-existing political community or local preference. Most fundamentally, these borders ignored nomadic and semi-nomadic populations entirely. Bedouin tribes that had moved seasonally across vast territories for centuries suddenly found their traditional migration routes crossed by new international borders controlled by different mandatory powers with different regulations. Tribe members found themselves citizens of different states with no legal mechanism for maintaining their traditional way of life. The long-term consequences of these arbitrary borders continue to shape Middle Eastern politics and conflict into the twenty-first century.

Resistance Suppression: Revolts and the Mandatory Response

Local populations did not passively accept mandatory rule. Revolts erupted across mandated territories as Arabs realized that European promises of independence had been lies and that the Mandate system was simply colonialism with new rhetoric. Mandatory powers responded with overwhelming military force, framing legitimate resistance to foreign occupation as criminality

and civilizational backwardness, just as Spanish conquistadors had framed indigenous resistance as paganism and European powers in Africa had framed resistance as savagery.

The 1920 Iraqi Revolt against British rule engulfed most of the country and required six months of British military operations to suppress. British forces used aerial bombardment against civilian villages, mass arrests, and collective punishment to break the rebellion. Winston Churchill, then Colonial Secretary, defended the use of poison gas against Iraqi tribes, arguing that it was not necessary to be "unduly squeamish about the use of gas against uncivilized tribes." The revolt cost 8,450 Iraqi lives while British forces lost 426 soldiers. The message was clear: mandatory control would be maintained by force regardless of local opposition or any rhetoric about preparing populations for self-government.

The 1925–1927 Syrian Revolt against French mandatory rule began as a Druze uprising but spread to Damascus and other cities, uniting multiple religious and ethnic communities against French control. French forces bombarded Damascus with artillery and aerial bombardment, destroying entire neighborhoods of the ancient city. French estimates put Syrian deaths at over 6,000, though actual numbers were likely far higher. France maintained control through divide-and-rule tactics, playing Christian against Muslim and various sects against each other while positioning France as a necessary mediator, precisely the same strategy employed by colonial powers in Africa and elsewhere.

The 1936–1939 Arab Revolt in Palestine represented the most sustained challenge to mandatory authority in the region. Palestinian Arabs revolted against both British control and British facilitation of Zionist settlement, which was increasing Palestinian displacement and threatening Palestinian national existence. Britain deployed 20,000 troops, implemented collective punishments including the demolition of entire villages, and established military courts that operated outside normal legal frameworks. British forces killed approximately 5,000 Palestinians, imprisoned tens of thousands, and demolished over 2,000 homes. British counterinsurgency tactics developed in Palestine became a template for later colonial policing operations worldwide.

Across all mandates, European powers justified this violence through narratives that framed local populations as irrational, violent, and ungrateful for the guidance they were receiving. Resistance to foreign occupation was characterized as banditry, tribalism, or religious fanaticism rather than legitimate political opposition to colonial rule. The mandatory powers' own violence was described as necessary police action to maintain order and protect civilization. The sacred trust of civilization meant in practice the right to use overwhelming force against populations who rejected European control.

Elite Coordination: The European Division of Spoils

The Mandate system represented a coordinated project among European powers to divide former Ottoman territories while maintaining the fiction of international oversight. The key negotiations occurred entirely among Europeans, with Arab representatives systematically excluded from decisions about their own futures. The Paris Peace Conference of 1919 featured

intense British-French negotiations over how to divide the Middle East. The United States, despite Woodrow Wilson's rhetoric about self-determination, ultimately deferred to British and French colonial interests in the region.

The Zionist movement, represented by European Jews, had more influence at the Paris Peace Conference than did Arab representatives who had actually fought against the Ottomans in alliance with Britain. The King-Crane Commission, sent by Wilson to survey Syrian public opinion, found overwhelming opposition to French mandatory control and support for either independence or, failing that, American or British administration rather than French. France vetoed publication of this report, and its findings were completely ignored in the actual allocation of mandates. The opinions of the people who would live under mandatory rule proved irrelevant to the determination of who would rule them.

The distribution of mandates reflected European power politics rather than local needs or preferences. France received Syria and Lebanon as compensation for accepting British control over Palestine and Iraq. Italy received nothing despite its wartime participation, breeding resentment that later fueled Mussolini's Mediterranean ambitions and contributed to the factors leading to World War II. The Zionist movement successfully lobbied for the Balfour Declaration's commitments to be incorporated into the Palestine Mandate text itself, meaning that Britain's mandatory responsibility included facilitating a "Jewish national home." This was a commitment made to a European political movement rather than to the territory's existing inhabitants, who constituted over ninety percent of the population.

Oil interests created complex coordination among multiple powers. The Iraq Petroleum Company divided oil rights among British, French, Dutch, and American companies, ensuring that Iraq's major resource would be controlled by a consortium of foreign powers rather than by Iraqis themselves. The 1928 Red Line Agreement divided Middle Eastern oil exploration rights among these same powers, explicitly excluding local governments from resource control decisions. This agreement drew a red line on a map encompassing most of the former Ottoman territories and stipulated that within this area, the signatory companies would not compete but would share access to oil resources.

Throughout this coordination, Arab agency was systematically excluded. Arab leaders who had believed British promises of independence, most notably Sharif Hussein of Mecca and his sons Faisal and Abdullah, discovered they had been deceived. Faisal was briefly installed as King of Syria by popular Syrian acclaim, then expelled by French forces implementing France's mandate. Britain gave him Iraq as a consolation prize. Abdullah received Transjordan. These weren't exercises in respecting local political will but rather British attempts to manage Arab disappointment while maintaining control over territories and resources.

Long-Term Consequences: The Architecture of Modern Middle Eastern Conflict

The Mandate system's legacy extends far beyond the formal end of mandates in the 1940s. The political structures, borders, and patterns of foreign intervention established during this period

created dynamics that continue to shape Middle Eastern politics and conflict into the twenty-first century. The arbitrary borders remain largely unchanged and continue to generate instability. The Kurdish question, the denial of statehood to a population of over thirty million people divided among Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria, stems directly from mandatory-era border drawing that deliberately fragmented Kurdish populations to prevent Kurdish nationalism from threatening any of the new states.

The Iraq-Kuwait border dispute that contributed to the 1990 Gulf War originated in British mandatory decisions that created Kuwait as a separate entity to maintain British control over Gulf ports while giving Iraq limited access to the sea. The Syrian civil war that began in 2011 has partially followed fault lines created by French division of Greater Syria and French policies of favoring certain sectarian groups over others. The Israel-Palestine conflict exists within territorial boundaries and political frameworks created by the British Mandate, including the fundamental contradiction of Britain promising both to facilitate Jewish settlement and to protect the existing Arab population's rights.

The political systems created by mandatory powers have proved remarkably durable in their dysfunction. Iraq's sectarian politics, with Sunni-Shia-Kurdish divisions dominating political organization, reflects both the arbitrary combination of these groups into one state and British mandatory policies of playing groups against each other to maintain control. Lebanon's confessional political system, which allocates government positions by religious sect, was designed by France to maintain Christian privilege and prevent unified opposition to French control. Syria's centralized authoritarian state structure, despite the rhetoric of different regimes over the decades, maintains patterns established by French mandatory control.

Economic underdevelopment traces directly to mandatory-era policies. The prevention of industrialization, the structuring of economies around raw material extraction and export particularly of oil, the tying of monetary systems to foreign currencies, and the creation of legal frameworks favoring foreign capital over local investment, all established during the mandate period, created dependencies that persisted after formal independence. Oil wealth, rather than funding broad-based development, became a prize to be controlled by whoever held state power, encouraging authoritarianism and inviting foreign intervention to secure access to this vital resource.

Perhaps most significantly, the Mandate system established a pattern of international intervention justified through humanitarian or developmental rhetoric that continues in the twenty-first century. The claim that Middle Eastern peoples need external guidance, the framing of regional conflicts as products of ancient hatreds or cultural deficiencies rather than recent political decisions made by colonial powers, and the assumption that Western powers have both the right and responsibility to intervene in regional affairs all echo the mandatory-era narrative that local populations were "not yet able to stand by themselves."

The Mandate system also fundamentally discredited liberal internationalism in the Middle East. The League of Nations, rather than protecting self-determination as its rhetoric suggested, had legitimized colonial control and facilitated the division of Arab territories among European

powers. This legacy shapes Middle Eastern skepticism toward international organizations and Western-promoted international law. When the United States later claimed to be promoting democracy and self-determination in the region, many Arabs heard echoes of British and French mandatory rhetoric and suspected similar gaps between stated principles and actual intentions, a suspicion that proved well-founded in cases such as the 2003 Iraq War.

Comparative Analysis: Patterns Across Three Systems

Functional Continuities Across Transforming Forms

Examining the Papal Bulls and Treaty of Tordesillas of 1493–1494, the Berlin Conference of 1884–1885, and the League of Nations Mandate System of 1919–1948 reveals a striking pattern. Despite the 456-year span separating the first system from the last, despite radical transformations in European power configurations, despite the shift from religious to secular authority, and despite the evolution from bilateral to multilateral to international organizational frameworks, the fundamental functional logic remained constant across all three systems.

All three systems performed identical core functions. First, they created legal frameworks among powerful states for appropriating other peoples' resources and territories. The Papal Bulls provided theological-legal sanction for Spanish and Portuguese conquest. The Berlin Conference created international law legitimating European colonial claims in Africa. The Mandate System established international trusteeship as legal cover for European control of Middle Eastern territories. In each case, the legal framework transformed what would otherwise appear as theft and conquest into lawful acquisition recognized by other powerful states.

Second, all three systems divided the non-European world among European powers. The Tordesillas system used a simple meridian line splitting the globe between Spain and Portugal. The Berlin Conference employed complex procedures for recognizing claims based on effective occupation. The Mandate System allocated former Ottoman territories among Britain, France, and other powers through League of Nations authorization. The mechanisms differed but the function was identical: determining which European power controlled which non-European territories.

Third, all three systems completely excluded indigenous and colonized peoples from decisions about their own lands and futures. Under Tordesillas, indigenous peoples had no legal standing and their lands were treated as available for Christian appropriation. Under Berlin, Africans had no representation, no recognition, and no sovereignty within the legal framework. Under the Mandate System, Arabs and other Middle Eastern peoples were consulted only for appearances while actual decisions were made entirely among European powers. The exclusion was absolute in all three cases.

Fourth, all three systems prevented inter-European conflict over colonial territories. Spain and Portugal avoided war through Tordesillas by recognizing each other's exclusive zones. The fourteen powers at Berlin avoided war through mutual recognition procedures and notification

requirements. Britain and France coordinated through the Mandate System to divide the Middle East peacefully between themselves while excluding other powers like Italy that might have caused complications. Coordinating elite competition to prevent elite losses remained constant.

Fifth, all three systems provided moral and narrative cover for extraction and violence. Tordesillas invoked evangelization and saving souls while enabling gold extraction and enslavement. Berlin proclaimed civilization, antislavery, and free trade while facilitating the rubber terror and forced labor systems that killed millions. The Mandate System proclaimed the sacred trust of civilization and preparation for self-government while extracting oil and suppressing independence movements with overwhelming force. The narratives evolved from religious to secular to developmental, but they always served the same function: making violent appropriation appear morally justified.

Sixth, all three systems enabled and legitimized systematic violence against colonized populations. Tordesillas authorized conquest, the encomienda system, and the Inquisition. Berlin's effective occupation requirement justified military campaigns and created dual legal systems subjecting Africans to administrative detention and corporal punishment. The Mandate System's framework allowed British and French forces to suppress revolts with aerial bombardment, collective punishment, and mass imprisonment. The violence was always extensive, always brutal, and always legally sanctioned within the colonial framework.

Seventh, all three systems facilitated maximum wealth extraction from colonized territories to European powers. Spanish and Portuguese extraction of gold, silver, and agricultural products under Tordesillas. European extraction of rubber, diamonds, minerals, and forced labor under Berlin. British and French extraction of oil, agricultural products, and strategic control under the Mandate System. The resources varied by geography and historical period, but the pattern of extraction, the flow of wealth from periphery to core, remained absolutely constant.

Surface Transformations Masking Structural Persistence

While functional continuities persisted, surface mechanisms transformed dramatically across the three systems. The source of authority evolved from divine papal authority in the Tordesillas system, through secular international law based on great power consensus at Berlin, to international organization through the League of Nations in the Mandate System. This evolution reflected broader European secularization and the development of international institutions, but it did not alter the fundamental nature of what was being authorized: European control over non-European territories.

The number of participating powers expanded from two Catholic monarchies under Tordesillas, to fourteen European states plus the United States at Berlin, to dozens of League of Nations members in the Mandate System. This expansion reflected the democratization of imperialism as more European states gained the capacity and desire to acquire colonies, and it required more sophisticated coordination mechanisms. The closed duopoly of Spain and Portugal could not accommodate rising powers, necessitating the more inclusive Berlin framework, which in turn gave way to the even more inclusive League system.

Geographic scope shifted from a simple meridian line dividing the entire globe between two powers under Tordesillas, through complex bilateral negotiations creating specific colonial boundaries in Africa under Berlin, to international mandate allocations for specific territories in the Middle East. The procedures evolved from papal decree followed by bilateral treaty, through multilateral conference establishing general principles followed by bilateral boundary negotiations, to international organization creating mandate agreements with ostensible oversight mechanisms.

Moral narratives transformed from evangelization and spreading Christianity under Tordesillas, through civilization and antislavery under Berlin, to development and preparation for self-government under the Mandate System. These narrative shifts reflected changing European intellectual fashions and the need to legitimate colonialism to increasingly skeptical audiences, but they did not reflect any change in the actual relationship between colonizer and colonized. Whether justified by saving souls, spreading civilization, or preparing for independence, the reality was systematic extraction and violent suppression of resistance.

Enforcement mechanisms evolved from excommunication threats and bilateral respect for boundaries under Tordesillas, through mutual recognition among great powers and diplomatic pressure under Berlin, to theoretical League of Nations oversight and mandatory reporting requirements under the Mandate System. Each system had enforcement mechanisms appropriate to its institutional context, but none of these mechanisms protected colonized peoples. They existed solely to coordinate among colonizing powers.

Why Forms Changed While Functions Persisted

The evolution of colonial legitimacy frameworks responded to specific historical pressures while maintaining core extraction logic. The Protestant Reformation beginning in 1517 fundamentally challenged papal authority, making it impossible to maintain a colonial system based on papal decrees. Protestant powers such as England and the Netherlands rejected the Pope's right to distribute the world, requiring a secular alternative to religious legitimacy. The Tordesillas system could not survive the fracturing of Western Christian unity.

Iberian decline meant Spain and Portugal could no longer enforce their monopoly by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Britain, France, and the Netherlands established colonies regardless of papal bulls or Tordesillas lines. The two-power system could not accommodate new colonial powers that had gained sufficient military and economic strength to take what they wanted. A new framework capable of coordinating multiple competing powers became necessary.

European secularization reduced the effectiveness of religious legitimation. Enlightenment thinking, scientific revolution, and the rise of nationalism created new bases for authority and new forms of justification. Appeals to civilization, progress, and historical development replaced religious duty as compelling narratives for European audiences. International law emerged as a secular alternative to theological frameworks, providing legitimacy that both Protestant and Catholic powers could accept.

Capitalist development created new extraction demands. Industrial capitalism required raw materials and markets at scales far beyond the mercantile era. More European powers wanted colonial access, requiring systems that could coordinate numerous competitors rather than just two. The Berlin Conference emerged precisely because industrial-era colonial competition threatened European war without agreed rules. The Mandate System emerged because oil's strategic importance made Middle Eastern control vital for modern industrial states.

Changing international norms required adaptation of legitimating narratives. By 1919, naked annexation had become politically difficult. Woodrow Wilson's promotion of self-determination, however cynically implemented, created rhetorical standards that colonial powers had to address. The Mandate System's genius was finding a way to maintain colonial control while appearing to respect self-determination by framing control as temporary trusteeship. The form adapted to new norms while the substance of colonial extraction persisted.

The lesson is clear: legitimacy frameworks must adapt when authority sources shift, when excluded powers gain sufficient strength to challenge existing arrangements, when dominant powers decline, when the number of competitors increases beyond what existing frameworks can manage, and when prevailing international norms change. Elite extraction systems update surface legitimacy mechanisms to accommodate these changes while maintaining core extraction logic. Understanding this pattern helps us recognize when similar adaptations are occurring in contemporary contexts.

The Doctrine of Discovery: Legal Theory Linking All Three Systems

Underlying all three colonial legitimacy frameworks is a consistent legal theory: the Doctrine of Discovery. This doctrine, which crystallized in the fifteenth century but has roots in earlier medieval legal thought, holds that Christian or European discovery of lands inhabited by non-Christian or non-European peoples grants the discovering power sovereign claims superior to any indigenous claims. The doctrine's core assumptions persisted across all three systems despite their surface differences.

In the Tordesillas system, the Papal Bulls explicitly invoked the discovery doctrine. Christian rulers were entitled to claim lands inhabited by pagans that they discovered. Indigenous peoples were deemed to have no full sovereignty, at best possessing occupancy rights that could be overridden by Christian claims. Europeans were positioned as superior and entitled to claim empty or underutilized lands, with European definitions of proper land use determining what counted as utilization. The first European to discover a territory held superior claims against indigenous peoples, though competing European claims had to be resolved through the papal-Iberian framework.

In the Berlin Conference system, effective occupation represented the secularized version of the discovery doctrine. The first European power to establish presence in an African territory and meet the effective occupation requirements gained internationally recognized claims. Africans were deemed to have no recognized sovereignty under international law. Europeans were still positioned as entitled to claim territories, now justified by civilization rather than Christianity. The

doctrine's core assumption that European presence created legitimate claims superior to indigenous presence remained unchanged despite the secular language.

In the Mandate System, the discovery doctrine appeared in its most sophisticated form. Former Ottoman territories were deemed to require European tutelage despite having been governed by a recognized empire for centuries. Local populations were described as "not yet able to stand by themselves," denying their capacity for self-government. European powers were positioned as uniquely qualified to administer these territories and prepare them for eventual independence, with Europeans determining when populations were ready. The doctrine's fundamental assumption that non-European peoples required European control persisted beneath the trusteeship rhetoric.

From 1493 to 1948, spanning 455 years, the fundamental legal theory justifying European appropriation of non-European territories never changed in substance. Europeans claimed the right to determine sovereignty over lands inhabited by non-Europeans. Indigenous or non-European sovereignty was either denied entirely or deemed inferior to European claims. Procedures established among Europeans determined the legitimacy of territorial claims with no role for indigenous peoples. Non-Europeans were treated as objects rather than subjects of international law, lacking agency in legal frameworks determining control over their own territories.

The persistence of this doctrine into contemporary international law demonstrates the endurance of colonial legal structures. Modern land rights disputes between indigenous peoples and settler states still invoke or challenge discovery doctrine principles. Resource extraction on indigenous lands operates within legal frameworks descended from colonial systems. Territorial claims such as the Falklands dispute invoke discovery-era legal principles. The legal structures created over five centuries ago to justify European colonial expansion continue to shape international law and relations between indigenous peoples and states built on their territories.

Conclusion: The Continuity of Colonial Extraction

This comparative analysis of three pivotal colonial legitimacy frameworks spanning 455 years reveals a fundamental pattern about how power operates across historical periods. Elite extraction systems adapt surface legitimacy mechanisms to changing power configurations and ideological contexts while maintaining identical functional logic. The source of authority transformed from divine right through papal bulls, to secular international law through the Berlin Conference, to international organization through the League of Nations. The participating powers expanded from two Catholic monarchies, to fourteen imperial states, to dozens of League members. The procedures evolved from simple meridian lines, through effective occupation requirements, to mandate agreements with supposed oversight. The moral narratives shifted from evangelization, through civilization, to development and trusteeship.

Yet beneath these transformations, the core functions remained constant. All three systems created legal frameworks among powerful states to legitimize appropriation of other peoples'

territories and resources. All three divided the non-European world among European powers through procedures that excluded colonized peoples entirely. All three prevented conflicts among the powerful while enabling systematic violence against the powerless. All three constructed moral narratives masking material extraction. All three facilitated wealth flows from periphery to core through supposedly lawful mechanisms.

The evolution occurred because legitimacy frameworks must adapt when foundational conditions change. The Protestant Reformation destroyed the universal Christian authority necessary for the Tordesillas system. The rise of new colonial powers and Iberian decline required frameworks that could coordinate more than two states. Secularization demanded non-religious justifications. Industrial capitalism created extraction needs requiring coordination among multiple industrial powers. International norms around self-determination, however hypocritically applied, required new rhetorical formulations. Each transformation responded to specific historical pressures while maintaining the fundamental relationship of European domination and non-European subordination.

The consequences of these systems persist into the present. The borders created at Berlin and through the Mandate System remain flashpoints for conflict across Africa and the Middle East. The economic structures established under colonial frameworks continue extracting resources from former colonies to former metropoles through supposedly neutral market mechanisms and investment treaties. The legal frameworks created to enable colonial appropriation, particularly the Doctrine of Discovery, remain embedded in international law affecting indigenous peoples globally. The patterns of intervention justified through humanitarian or developmental rhetoric echo the civilizing mission and sacred trust narratives of earlier eras.

Most significantly, international institutions ostensibly representing global interests actually coordinate elite interests and maintain extraction patterns. The United Nations Security Council's permanent membership consists largely of former colonial powers maintaining veto authority over global security decisions. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund operate with voting weighted by economic power, ensuring former colonizers dominate supposedly universal financial institutions. Structural adjustment programs and debt servicing continue wealth transfers from South to North under new names. Trade agreements protect multinational corporate interests, often from former colonizing countries, while limiting developing states' sovereignty. The form has evolved from Papal Bulls through Berlin Conference to contemporary international organizations, but the function of coordinating powerful states' access to less powerful states' resources persists.

Understanding this pattern matters precisely because it continues. When powerful states want to control other states' territories or resources, they create legal frameworks among themselves legitimating this control, construct moral narratives justifying intervention, exclude affected populations from meaningful participation in decisions, adapt these mechanisms when power configurations or ideological contexts change, yet maintain extraction logic despite surface changes in authority sources, procedures, or rhetoric. Recognizing this pattern enables us to identify when it recurs under new forms.

The contemporary language of development, good governance, humanitarian intervention, and democracy promotion should be examined with the same critical scrutiny applied to earlier narratives of evangelization, civilization, and trusteeship. The question is not whether stated intentions are sincere, though they often are not, but whether the actual function reproduces patterns of extraction and subordination regardless of stated purposes. Do contemporary frameworks exclude affected populations from meaningful participation in decisions? Do they facilitate resource flows from periphery to core? Do they enable violence when resistance occurs? Do they benefit elite networks in powerful states while subordinating populations in less powerful states? If the answers are yes, then we are witnessing adaptation of colonial patterns rather than their transcendence.

For those seeking to resist these patterns or build alternative frameworks, understanding this history provides crucial insights. Legitimacy frameworks created by and for elites to enable extraction are not natural or unchangeable, even when they claim universal validity. They emerged from specific historical conditions and can be challenged when those conditions change or when excluded populations gain sufficient power to demand fundamental restructuring. True alternatives would require genuine inclusion of affected populations in decision-making, resource sovereignty allowing communities to control their own resources and development, recognition of indigenous sovereignty rejecting the Doctrine of Discovery entirely, restructuring international institutions to actually represent global populations rather than concentrating power in former colonial states, and accountability mechanisms with real enforcement power to prevent extraction and subordination.

The pattern revealed across these three case studies is both sobering and illuminating. Elite extraction systems have demonstrated remarkable adaptability across five centuries, updating surface legitimacy mechanisms to accommodate changing power configurations and ideological contexts while maintaining core extraction logic. From Papal Bulls to Berlin Conference to League of Nations Mandates to contemporary international institutions, the same fundamental pattern recurs: powerful states creating rules among themselves to legitimize taking what belongs to others, constructing moral narratives to justify violence and extraction, excluding those being exploited from any meaningful agency, and adapting when necessary to preserve the essential relationship of domination.

Yet understanding this pattern also reveals its contingency. These frameworks succeeded only as long as specific conditions held: shared recognition of authority sources, ability of dominant powers to enforce arrangements, and insufficient strength among excluded parties to effectively challenge the system. When Protestant powers rejected papal authority, when Iberian powers weakened, when colonized peoples organized effective resistance, the systems adapted or collapsed. This suggests that while colonial patterns have proved remarkably durable, they are not inevitable. They persist because they serve powerful interests and because understanding of their nature remains limited. Making their operation visible, tracing their evolution, and recognizing their continuity under changing forms are essential first steps toward building frameworks that genuinely serve humanity rather than perpetuating centuries-old patterns of extraction and subordination.

Thematic Bibliography

The Doctrine of Discovery and Colonial Legal Theory

Miller, Robert J., Jacinta Ruru, Larissa Behrendt, and Tracey Lindberg. *Discovering Indigenous Lands: The Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Benton, Lauren. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Fitzmaurice, Andrew. *Sovereignty, Property and Empire, 1500-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Anghie, Antony. *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Papal Bulls and the Treaty of Tordesillas

Davenport, Frances Gardiner, ed. *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648*. Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1917.

Seed, Patricia. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Pagden, Anthony. *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500-c. 1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Restall, Matthew. *Seven Myths of the Spanish Conquest*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

The Berlin Conference and the Scramble for Africa

Förster, Stig, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, and Ronald Robinson, eds. *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa: The Berlin Conference, 1884-1885, and the Onset of Partition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Crowe, Sybil Eyre. *The Berlin West African Conference, 1884-1885*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Pakenham, Thomas. *The Scramble for Africa*. New York: Random House, 1991.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000 [1955].

The League of Nations Mandate System

Pedersen, Susan. *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt, 1989.

Sluglett, Peter. *Britain in Iraq: Contriving King and Country*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Provence, Michael. *The Great Syrian Revolt and the Rise of Arab Nationalism*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005.

Khalidi, Rashid. *The Iron Cage: The Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2006.

International Law and Colonial Legitimacy

Koskenniemi, Martti. *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Anaya, S. James. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Chimni, B.S. *International Law and World Order: A Critique of Contemporary Approaches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Pahuja, Sundhya. *Decolonising International Law: Development, Economic Growth and the Politics of Universality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Colonial Ideology and Narrative Construction

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.

Mudimbe, V.Y. *The Invention of Africa: Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution, Volume 1: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Lowe, Lisa. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

Colonial Violence and Resistance

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004 [1961].

Anderson, David M., and David Killingray, eds. *Policing and Decolonisation: Politics, Nationalism and the Police, 1917-65*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Elkins, Caroline. *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya*. New York: Henry Holt, 2005.

Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1972.

Davis, Mike. *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World*. London: Verso, 2001.

Comparative Colonial Studies

Young, Crawford. *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Fieldhouse, D.K. *The Colonial Empires: A Comparative Survey from the Eighteenth Century*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Abernethy, David B. *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415-1980*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Mamdani, Mahmood. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Colonial Economics and Extraction

Amin, Samir. *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994 [1944].

Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A Global History*. New York: Knopf, 2014.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*. London: Verso, 2011.

Patnaik, Utsa, and Prabhat Patnaik. *A Theory of Imperialism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

Colonial Legacies and Postcolonial Persistence

Mbembe, Achille. *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea, 1815 to the Present*. New York: Penguin Press, 2012.

Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: New Press, 2007.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J. *Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonization*. Dakar: CODESRIA, 2013.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*